

Fort Hays State University FHSU Scholars Repository

Faculty Senate

Archives Online

4-14-1964

Fort Hays State University Faculty Senate Minutes, April 14, 1964

FHSU Faculty Senate

Follow this and additional works at: https://scholars.fhsu.edu/sen_all

Recommended Citation

FHSU Faculty Senate, "Fort Hays State University Faculty Senate Minutes, April 14, 1964" (1964). *Faculty Senate*. 432.
https://scholars.fhsu.edu/sen_all/432

This Minutes is brought to you for free and open access by the Archives Online at FHSU Scholars Repository. It has been accepted for inclusion in Faculty Senate by an authorized administrator of FHSU Scholars Repository.

Minutes of the meeting of the Faculty Senate, Tuesday, April 14, 1964 at 4:00 p.m.
in the Office of the Dean of the Faculty.

Members present: Dr. Bartholomew, Mr. Berland, Mr. Dalton, Dr. Edwards,
Mrs. Hellem, Mr. Marcus, Dr. Pierson, Miss Rowlands,
Mr. Spomer, Miss Veed, and Dr. Garwood, Chairman

Members absent: Dr. Coder, Dr. Falls, and Dr. Staven

Others present: Dr. Dick and Mr. Faulkner

The chairman called the meeting to order for the transaction of business.
Dr. Garwood said that when we met the last time, our thinking was that we
should take the Proposal for the Evaluation of Instruction and the Evaluation
of Instruction forms which were presented to the Senate by the Improvement of
Instruction Committee to the division staff members and get their reactions.
Dr. Garwood asked the Senate members to report. The following reports were
made:

Mr. Spomer - Economics and Business

- Comments:
1. One person felt that the form had a negative approach.
 2. There was concern expressed by at least one person that the results might get into the hands of the administration.
 3. It was the opinion of the group that ten evaluations are not enough for a fair analysis.
 4. Several people said that the students were not qualified to evaluate staff members.
 5. It was stated by several that if an evaluation is to be carried out, it should be carried out by subject area.
 6. There was considerable discussion of the evaluation form itself.

Action: The group voted (14 to 1) against using the evaluation as recommended by the ASC.

The group also went on record (15 to 1) in favor of a student evaluation of staff members.

Dr. Edwards - Language, Literature and Speech

- Comments:
1. There should be voluntary (on the part of the faculty) student evaluation by the faculty if the mechanics are acceptable.
 2. The group went on record as opposed to the mechanics outlined in the proposal.

Dr. Edwards' report continued:

3. It was recommended that samples of other standard evaluation questionnaires be obtained and circulated among the faculty before a choice is made.
4. It was suggested that the question, "Who is the best teacher you have ever had on this campus?" be deleted.
5. It was suggested that a "no opinion" response be added.
6. It was suggested that the results of any teacher evaluation by students be made available to the individual faculty member only.
7. It was suggested that the evaluation be administered by faculty members or by administrators.
8. Every student of a class should fill out the form.
9. Delete questions numbered 3 and 4 from Part IV: Cheating.
10. It was also suggested that an evaluation of teaching would be helpful for beginning instructors.
11. It was suggested that use be made of the Alumni Office to poll graduates after 4 or 5 years.
12. It was suggested that tape recorders might be made available to instructors.

Dr. Pierson - Biological Science

- Comments:
1. Some felt that the questions were phrased in the negative rather than the positive.
 2. Some felt that students need to let off steam but what good would the analysis of the information received following the administration of the form actually do.
 3. The method of sampling was most strongly objected to.
 4. Comments concerning specific items on the interview-questionnaire form:
 - a. II-2. Characteristic of student, not instructor?
 - b. II-5. Can student answer this when teacher usually can't?
 - c. II-13. More than instruction involved here?
 - d. III-5. Can this really be evaluated?
 - e. IV-3,4. Questions more basic than evaluation of instruction?

Dr. Pierson's comments: "I wish to know how I can do a better job of reaching students. Their help is both desired and appreciated. I will use any form that is chosen but I will insist that it be evaluated by someone other than myself and that I receive the summary of the form. I wish no chance to identify students. Further, I would prefer, as an individual, to find out the answers to some of these questions about twice during the progress of a course."

Miss Rowlands - Nurse Education

- Comments:
1. None of the instructors liked the informal distribution of evaluation forms out on the campus or in the union.

Miss Rowlands' report continued:

2. If evaluation is to be done, it should be done individually - No talking back and forth between students while the evaluation is going on.
3. One instructor liked the suggestions that an outsider come in and administer it to the entire class.
4. The remainder of the instructors felt they did not like this arrangement. It is a waste of class time. The instructor does not have ten minutes to spare. The students will complain this is a waste of learning time. The students are not getting what they have paid for.
5. One instructor felt the student should have more time to complete the form. Perhaps a week to think over the questions and then hand it back might be better.
6. All instructors agreed with having student council members take charge of the distribution of the questionnaires.
7. All instructors liked the questions in the questionnaire and thought they were fair. They thought the questionnaire tested the instructors ability to motivate students.

Mrs. Hellem - Library Science

- Comments:
1. The general feeling was that the questionnaire was pretty much all right except for the wording of one or two questions and the relevancy of another pertaining to cheating.
 2. A strong objection was made to the method of administering the questions. It was felt that no valid results would come from this method.
 3. It was suggested that there should be a correlative follow-up to this, giving the teacher a chance to defend himself in case of too heavy work load, teaching out of his field, or improper equipment.
 4. It was thought that a pilot study might be made, using a volunteer department or division, or possibly the Improvement of Instruction Committee itself.
 5. More than one method of administration might be submitted to the faculty for approval.

The questionnaire was approved with a few reservations, but it was suggested that the administration should be tried out in a pilot study first if a volunteer group can be found. A correlative follow-up questionnaire might be sent to the faculty so they might give their views of their own weaknesses if they feel any are present.

Dr. Bartholomew - Music

Comments: It was felt that:

1. Satisfactory as long as evaluation is not based required courses;
2. Mechanics of test were generally bad;
3. Evaluation should be based on an entire class;
4. Students are not qualified to judge.
 - a. Past experience with voluntary evaluation has shown that students lack ability to make accurate judgment.
 - b. Evaluators should be upper-division students.
5. Evaluation would have little effect on quality of instruction;
6. Evaluation should be carried out by administration, not by students;
7. Evaluation would be related to grade received by evaluator;
8. Results would fall into hands of administration;
9. Evaluation should show whether it is based on major or general education teaching. Some think evaluation should be carried out by majors in the department of the instructor evaluated;
10. It's a good idea if it will help; some teachers need the information.

Mr. Marcus - Social Science

- Comments:
1. The proposal of the Improvement of Instruction Committee was rejected in its entirety.
 2. No precedent, giving the students the right to rate the faculty, should be established by the Faculty Senate.
 3. If such a precedent were established, the rating forms should be used on a voluntary basis and the results should be given only to the instructors and not sent to the data processing center.
 4. If such a voluntary format were accepted, the rating forms should be given to entire classes, not to groups of ten handpicked by the students.
 5. A system should be devised whereby the various administrative offices would be rated by both students and faculty.

Miss Veed - Physical Science

- Comments:
1. It was felt that such a small sampling of students would not give a valid evaluation. The questionnaires should be distributed to at least one class.
 2. The validity of the questionnaire as a tool to evaluate instruction is questionable.
 3. Any evaluation should be voluntary on the part of the faculty.

Mr. Berland - Applied Arts

- Comments:
1. It was suggested that if the proposal were adopted the students should be selected from the library rather than the Union.
 2. It was noted that asking ten students who had taken a class under a certain instructor, would provide no control over the type of student responding.
 3. It was felt that if the students had been in different courses under the same instructor, the results of the questionnaire would not be fair because most instructors are better qualified to teach some courses than they are others.
 4. The present method of evaluating was regarded as adequate.
 5. A motion was made that the Applied Arts Division go on record as rejecting the Proposal for Evaluation of Instruction as proposed to the Faculty Senate by the ASC, and NCA Committee on Improvement of Instruction. Seconded. Carried unanimously.

Comments on the questionnaire were as follows:

1. No. 6 in Part I should be omitted.
2. Negative wording of the form was noted.
3. No. 8 in Part II should be omitted.
4. Answers to the questions should be merely "Yes or No" instead of "agree or disagree."
5. No. 12 in Part II was questioned.
6. No. 13 in Part II should be omitted.
7. Part IV dealing with cheating has no place in the evaluation of an instructor.
8. The rating might be changed from "agree or disagree" to "excellent, average, or poor."

It was noted that if the students were asked to rate an instructor as to excellent, average, or poor, the majority of answers would be average. College professors are not average people. They are either good or bad teachers. A college freshman, for example, will not have known enough teachers to classify them as excellent, average, or poor; but he will know whether his instructors are good or bad. Therefore, the answers to the questions should be answered "yes or no." It was suggested that evaluations might be made by graduate students. If the student is given this job he might get the idea that he is running things.

It was explained that the present form for the Evaluation of Teaching has been in use for quite a long time and it was given to the Committee for Improvement of Instruction for study and suggestions. Would the information be utilized by the administration on occasion?

Faculty Senate Minutes

April 14, 1964

- 6 -

The discussion will be continued at the next meeting of the Senate.

The meeting adjourned at 5:05 p.m.

John D. Garwood, Chairman

S. V. Dalton, Secretary

Florence Bodmer, Recorder